

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **28 April 2009**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33. Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Reed et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,288 hereinafter “Reed”), Bischoff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,377 hereinafter “Bischoff”), and Zintel (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,004, hereinafter “Zintel”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Examiner rejected 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 as being indefinite because the term “a priori” appears to be unclear. Applicant has amended these claims to clarify that “a prior” can mean “prior to initiating a data transfer.” Support for these amendments is found in instant application, pars. [0009], [0018], and [0056]. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 as being unpatentable over Reed in view of Bischoff and Zintel. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection. Neither Reed nor Zintel discloses a universal data transfer interface which does not have knowledge of the components’ **file system protocols or printer domain protocols, prior to initiating a data transfer**, where the data object controls the universal data transfer interface, **where the file system protocols indicate how to access files over a network, and where the printer domain protocols indicate how to print and manage print jobs over a network**.

Examiner states that Reed does not disclose a universal data transfer interface which does not have a priori knowledge of the components’ file system protocols or printer domain protocols, wherein the data object controls the universal data transfer interface.

Regarding Zintel, Examiner states that Zintel discloses a universal data transfer interface which does not have a priori knowledge of the components' file system protocols or printer domain protocols, wherein the data object controls the universal data transfer interface, citing Zintel, C5:L57-62 and C9:L67-C10-L1. For example in these passages, Zintel discloses enabling "any networked device to initiate a communication with any other networked device, without having established a prior relationship..." However, these cited passages describe **communication protocols**, but not **file system protocols** or **printer domain protocols**.

As well-known in the art, a communication protocol is a set of standard rules for data representation, signaling, authentication and error detection required to send information over a communications channel. Also as well known in the art, a file system protocol indicates how to access files over a network and a printer domain protocol indicates how to print and manage print jobs over a network. In short, a communication protocol is not the same as a file system protocol or a printer domain protocol. Zintel is silent on file system protocols and printer domain protocols.

In contrast, embodiments of the present invention involve a universal data transfer interface which does not have knowledge of the components' **file system protocols or printer domain protocols, prior to initiating a data transfer**, wherein the data object controls the universal data transfer interface, **where the file system protocols indicate how to access files over a network, and where the printer domain protocols indicate how to print and manage print jobs over a network**. See instant application, par. [0003].

Nothing within Reed or Bischoff, suggests or implies a universal data transfer interface that does **not** have knowledge of the components' domain specific **file system domain** or **printer domain** protocols, prior to initiating a data transfer.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 to clarify that embodiments of the present invention involve a universal

data transfer interface which does not have knowledge of the components' **file system protocols or printer domain protocols, prior to initiating a data transfer**, wherein the data object controls the universal data transfer interface, **where the file system protocols indicate how to access files over a network, and where the printer domain protocols indicate how to print and manage print jobs over a network**. These amendments find support in instant application, par. [0003], [0018], and [0056]. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9-11, which depend upon claim 8, claims 14-18, which depend upon claim 12, claims 20-22, which depend upon claim 19, claims 25-29, which depend upon claim 23, and claims 31-33, which depend upon claim 30, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /ShunYao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 28 July 2009

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com